

UNIT 01

QUALITY MANAGEMENT, EVALUATION, CONTROLLING



Literacy Centre for Adults in Sierra Leone

2010 ANNUAL REPORT - EVALUATION

In charge: Stefan Jahn

Report prepared by
Dr. Bernhard Höper, Stefan Jahn,
Peter Kowoll, Dr. Petra Speier-Werner

Bonn, July 2011

Contents

	Page	
0	Summary	1
1	A look back at 2009: Implementation of recommendations	2
2	Changes to the unit S01 in 2010	3
3	Evaluations during the 2010 reporting period	3
	3.1 Methodological approach	3
	3.2 Evaluations completed	4
4	Results from 2010 evaluations	5
	4.1 Evaluation of overseas programmes	5
	4.1.1 Comprehensive evaluation of overseas co-operation pursuant to DAC criteria	5
	4.1.2 Other evaluations	8
	4.1.3 Annual theme "Help towards Self-Help"	11
	4.1.4 Sector and programme evaluations	11
	4.2 Evaluation of project project work in Germany	12
5	Looking towards 2011	13
6	Management letter and recommendations	14
Annexes		
Annex 1:	A life story from Sierra Leone	
Annex 2:	Number and overall result of evaluations carried out in 2010	

0 Summary

Effective 1 May 2010, the two units "Evaluation" and "Quality Management" along with "Controlling" were combined into the unit "Quality Management, Evaluation, Controlling". This has no effect on evaluation tasks and objectives, and the understanding of the same.

A total of 17 evaluations were commissioned in 2010, including 15 individual evaluations of overseas projects. Added to this were a programme evaluation for Ethiopia/Somaliland and a WASH sector evaluation. Individual evaluations for overseas projects were extensively analysed with respect to average goal attainment and fulfilment of the DAC criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome and impact, and sustainability. The evaluation aims to achieve a general assessment of the quality of programme and project work.

Overall, Welthungerhilfe projects are rated very positively; this statement applies equally to their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and outcome/impact. It is not possible to provide a higher-level statement on sustainability with regard to the projects evaluated in 2010. This is due to the fact that some reviewers were not able to provide reliable and resilient statements on sustainability, sometimes simply because this factor could not yet be assessed at the time of the evaluation.

In contrast to the previous year, the comprehensive evaluation of DAC criteria did not include any subsequent differentiation of their dimensions. Statements to this effect were not considered resilient due to the small number of samples, but also in view of the methodology.

Statements regarding the quality of programme work often fail to adequately acknowledge the excellent performance of project staff. They are often faced with the challenge of having to fulfil high expectations in the most difficult of conditions. Key conclusions drawn by the unit are underlined by quotations from the respective evaluation report in order to highlight local realities.

Similarly, an overall view of all evaluations conducted does not address the living conditions under which the people in "our" countries live (see Annex 1).

The control and verifiable success of overseas projects depends greatly on the quality of the monitoring process. In general, monitoring for evaluated "older" projects is limited to activities, while impact indicators are not given sufficient consideration.

The unit Quality Management, Evaluation, Controlling pursues an ongoing process of achieving qualitative improvements to its evaluation work and the learning processes initiated as a result. Several modifications will be introduced in 2011 to make the work carried out by the unit more effective and efficient. This will include dividing the item "outcome/impact" into two separate sub-sections in the outline of the evaluation report.

The Management Letter conclusively summarises the unit's recommendations. They relate in particular to improving impact monitoring and the creation of the framework conditions that are required for implementation.

In addition, the reference to "good/best practices" should explicitly address the required framework conditions. Recommendations are also offered for the integration of national staff in management positions as well as regarding the design of cooperations with southern partners.

1 A look back at 2009: Implementation of recommendations

The systematic response to and subsequent pursuit of the recommendations forms a part of the evaluation standard¹⁾. In fact, intensive technical exchange takes place within Welthungerhilfe between the local project manager(s), the Regional Desk in Bonn, the external evaluators and the unit regarding the evaluation report and recommendations contained therein. However, the process regarding the subsequent pursuit of the recommendations is at present not a systematic one, nor is it documented so as to allow for a higher-level evaluation of the implementation of recommendations (this also applies to the evaluation unit itself). One exception in this regard is the standard query for the recommendations and their implementation as part of the project planning document of follow-up projects, for which the "previous project" was evaluated.

In the past, there were no standardized institutional procedures for following up on the recommendations (in contrast to the Audit unit). Therefore the Evaluation unit is not able (or may only do so at great expense) to arrive at an overall assessment of the actual relevance and outcome/impact of its own work.

The unit does not focus on the question of whether the recommendations are being implemented; this is related to operational control and is therefore the responsibility of the operational area. Rather, it is concerned with knowing how many of the evaluation recommendations are approved - or the reasons why a recommendation has been rejected. Particularly the reasons for rejections of recommendations can provide valuable information for the further development of the unit's work. To this extent, the unit foresees the requirement of a binding systematic query regarding the implementation of recommendations, or comments for the same.

Regardless of this general finding, the implementation of the higher-level recommendations from the 2009 Annual Report (see page 22 and following) is assessed as follows:

- ✓ The process of establishing "outcome and impact-oriented monitoring" in Welthungerhilfe's programmes and projects on a binding basis will continue to be driven forward, but can only be implemented in the medium term.
- ✓ The content-related discussion around the topic of sustainability should be intensified; some ideas in this regard are provided by the unit's 2009 Annual Report (see page 15).

The 2009 Annual report outlined additional recommendations that are more likely to be significant for the strategic planning process for 2012-2014.

- ✓ The decentralisation strategies in several partner countries offer new opportunities of cooperation between government agencies and NGOs, as well as new platforms for a civil society dialogue at the community level. There is still a lot of unused potential with respect to a South-South exchange.
- ✓ There is also a tendency towards more self-implementation with a view of project support. At the very same time, concrete cooperation with local partners is often carried out in the form of "subcontract partners". Hence it is necessary to critically appraise and update the Welthungerhilfe partner concept.

¹⁾ DAC Series Guidelines and Principles: Quality standard for development evaluation, page 15
ISBN 978-92-64-085183, OECD 2010

2 Changes to the S01 unit in 2010

Effective 1 May 2010, the two units "Evaluation and Quality Management" along with "Controlling" were combined into the unit "Quality Management, Evaluation, Controlling". One of the objectives of this process was to reduce the management range of the Chairman of the Board. Secondly, this process established an entity that is able to provide key impulses for operational control and strategy development because of its overall view of processes, contents and content-related quality, as well as available resources.

This does not result in any changes to the evaluation's tasks and objectives. The intention is to contribute towards the improvement of policies, programmes and projects through the feedback of experience and the creation of a basis for the organisation's accountability. Both objectives apply equally to quality management as well as controlling.

The amalgamation does not affect the understanding of the evaluation itself. The principle of independence with regard to the selection of external evaluators and acceptance of the evaluation report, as well as the summarising evaluation in the annual report, remain unchanged.

3 Evaluations during the 2010 reporting period

3.1 Methodological approach

The unit performs comprehensive evaluations on the basis of the final debriefing meetings and the respective individual evaluation reports as such. In this context, all project evaluations and evaluation results have the same weight in terms of their contribution to the "overall assessment" ("one project, one vote") - regardless of whether the examined project support is EUR 100,000 or EUR 10 million.

The comprehensive evaluation explicitly refers to the internationally valid DAC criteria and hence to an investigation of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome/impacts, and sustainability. The overall evaluation (see Annex 2) is based on 5 assessment levels.

Initially, each individual project is assessed in accordance with DAC criteria on the basis of the 5 assessment levels. The percentage share of each valuation level is calculated for each DAC criterion across all projects, in order to derive trends for overall project work. Individual assessments per project are not shown for the following reasons in particular:

- The objective of the annual report is to provide an overall view of project work. The concrete need for action for any individual project is the result of the respective individual evaluation report, and is implemented by the Regional Desk Heads, regional coordinators and project managers.
- In 2010 and previous years, it was the evaluation unit that performed the allocations to the various assessment levels; this will be the responsibility of the external evaluators starting in 2011.

In contrast to previous years, there will no longer be a differentiated assessment of the individual dimensions of the DAC criteria.

- Statements on sustainability and indirect impacts are often times impossible, because the time of the evaluation is "too early" for this purpose. Also, short project durations do not lend themselves to generating indirect impacts and sustainability.
- To date, the outline of the evaluation report did not make an explicit distinction between direct and indirect effects, so that concrete statements on impact dimensions have little resilience.

- Individual projects are often conducted under the most difficult of conditions in dynamic environments. A differentiated examination of individual dimensions for the purpose of controlling a project is helpful. However, a summary of these individual results is not resilient and, in view of the objectives of an annual report, not required.

3.2 Evaluations completed

A total of 17 evaluations were carried out in 2010, including 15 individual project evaluations, one country programme and a one sector evaluation.

The decline in the number of actual evaluations commissioned by the Bonn unit (28 evaluations in 2008, 29 evaluations in 2009) is the result of an intentional management decision. As part of the restructuring process in 2008, it was decided that the unit would increase its focus on sector and regional programmes. In turn, more individual project evaluations would be carried out by the Regional Desks / regional offices as part of decentralised evaluations (so-called "reviews"). However, a survey conducted by the unit in February 2011 regarding decentralised evaluations that were carried out in 2010 showed that this second step has not been carried out in a systematic or consistent fashion to date. In total, only 9 reviews were carried out in 2010.

The number of project evaluations also reflects the staffing situation at the unit in 2010, which was characterised by turnover and vacancies in the evaluation unit.

Security Aspects

Welthungerhilfe is also active in countries that feature a difficult security situation. However, similarly to 2010, no appraisal assignments had to be postponed or cancelled for security reasons.

The security conditions under which much of the staff works and implements Welthungerhilfe projects, must be taken into account in the assessment of achieved or achievable project purposes and objectives. The following excerpt taken from an evaluation report (personal and geographic information in an anonymous form) highlights how difficult these conditions can be:

“Due to the remoteness and vastness of the area in combination with the complexity of faction and tribal based conflicts, no agency or organization has so far been able to apply standard security analysis schemes for (...) This means that future developments with regard to the severity of conflict and the possible locations of incidents cannot be predicted at all.

Since September 2008, when Welthungerhilfe’s vehicles were targets of car hijacking (...) Welthungerhilfe (...) is using locally hired cars and drivers. After two female expatriate staff had been kidnapped (...) Welthungerhilfe’s policy was adapted accordingly. Since then, Welthungerhilfe’s expatriate staff does not stay overnight (...) and is using only (...) helicopters for field trips.

(...) The neutrality of the Deputy Head of Projects (as of Welthungerhilfe) is respected by all sides (...). He can therefore clear every staff field trip in advance with all parties involved (every field trip has to be announced to him 48 h in advance). He is bearing immense responsibility for the staff. Without him, Welthungerhilfe would not be able to work (...)”

4 Results from 2010 evaluations

4.1 Evaluation of overseas programmes

4.1.1 Comprehensive evaluation of overseas co-operation

The comprehensive evaluation of project evaluations is always a difficult task. This applies both to accountability (average goal attainment for all projects and average fulfilment of DAC criteria across all projects) as well as the intended contribution to institutional learning.

According to last year's annual report, with respect to the evaluations carried out in 2009 the reviewers were much better able to build their analyses on the projects' own monitoring records and baseline studies, as compared to previous years. This positive finding must be curtailed for 2010.

The majority of reviewers found that project monitoring is activity-based and only rarely includes the use of output or even direct (outcome) or indirect (impact) effects.

The overall evaluation of all the project evaluations conducted must also take into account the framework conditions of the project work. This applies not just in respect of the previously mentioned security aspects but also the social, institutional, ecological and economic conditions that generally have more of an effect on the project work than they are influenced by it.

*"As described in the previous sections, a large number of project measures and the interaction between them have had a positive effect on food security and peaceful development. In this vein, the framework conditions significantly influenced the success of the project. They were particularly supportive of peace and reconciliation work (peaceful development and reduction in polarisations from civil war) and posed a particularly strong hindrance for food security (harvest losses due to changed climatic conditions with an increasing pressure on resources and other unfavourable factors). The weakness of local government leadership had an unfavourable effect on all project events, including a lack of initiative for the implementation of future-oriented development and a culture of non-prosecution for all types of offences. In particular, it puts into question the sustainability of comprehensive measures for erosion protection and the rehabilitation of agricultural production potentials, which are particularly well suited to reduce structural conflict causes."*²⁾

*"Until around 2000, Zimbabwe was a net exporter of food. The agricultural sector employed around 1 million people, or roughly 10 % of the present population or about 30% of adults. 40% of gross national product was derived from primary production. Zimbabwe has the potential to be a bread basket of regional importance. The potential impact of projects, such as the one under evaluation, is minimal compared to the impetus that a stable and legally secure political system would provide. Once good governance returns to Zimbabwe, the country has the potential to evolve rapidly. The citizens will enthusiastically subscribe to any national effort to rebuild their country, with foreign investors providing much of the funding."*³⁾

The statements summarised below (see Annex 2) regarding selected aspects of project implementation are understood as ideas and information pointing towards possible trends; they cannot be more than that.

²⁾ Birgit Kundermann, Main report on the evaluation "Food security and peace in Northern Burundi", page 46
Welthungerhilfe project number BDI 1010-07

³⁾ Harald Nicolay, Main report on the evaluation "Agricultural transition and drinking water project",
page 24, Welthungerhilfe project number ZWE 1032-08

Relevance

Welthungerhilfe projects are characterised by a very high degree of relevance. 80% and 13% of the projects feature very good and good relevance, respectively. None of the evaluations point towards incoherence with the requirements of the target groups, with a view to Welthungerhilfe's mission according to its statutes, or in relation to government programmes.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the projects can be assessed as high overall. More than 53% of projects are assessed as very good and good, with another 27% as satisfactory (hence a total of 80% as positive). Only 20% of projects have been assessed as unsatisfactory in terms of effectiveness.

One reason behind the "worse" result as compared to relevance could be the fact that projects frequently perform activity monitoring (which is necessary but not sufficient by itself), but not systematic impact monitoring. This means that it is very difficult to make immediate adjustments to activities during the project (if required) in order to achieve the intended direct and indirect outcome/impacts, and hence the project purposes.

Efficiency

Welthungerhilfe projects and project measures are very efficient. Approximately 43% feature very good, and 36% feature good efficiency. Seven percent of projects have deficits in this regard.

This positive assessment applies not only to emergency response projects, but also to projects in the area of rural development, which tend to be more personnel cost intensive in relation to the project budget.

Outcome and impact

To date, the outline of the evaluation report has combined the direct (outcome) and indirect (impact) effects under one item, with the result that statements regarding the outcome/impacts of the projects are not always explicitly allocated to one of the two effects categories. In addition, it must be noted that in practice the distinction between outcome and impact is still not always drawn as accurately as required in theory.

The summarising statements regarding the outcome/impacts of Welthungerhilfe projects therefore relate more to the more general term "effect". In the future, this will require a precise differentiation by the evaluators (see item 5 of the annual report).

The average impact of projects evaluated in 2010 is good, but overall weaker than the 3 aforementioned DAC criteria.

Still, 21% of the projects achieve a very good outcome/impact, and 50% achieve a good outcome/impact. Another 21% can be deemed satisfactory.

With a view to the comprehensive evaluation, it was noted that framework conditions have a much stronger impact on a project than they are affected by the project itself. In this respect, it must be assumed that during the course of a project, the framework conditions generally have stronger - positive and negative - effects on local and regional development than the respective individual project.

It is unlikely that there is a way out of this dilemma (intervention as a "drop in the bucket" as compared to framework conditions that have manifested themselves), other than the commit-

ment already formulated in the "Welthungerhilfe Strategy 2007-2011"⁴⁾ regarding cooperation with partner organisation and the strategic goal of significantly supporting their involvement in the political decision-making process in their countries.

However, a Welthungerhilfe project in Liberia shows that under certain conditions, individual projects can have a positive effect on framework conditions.

In Liberia, Welthungerhilfe enjoys a prominent position since it has been active in that country as one of the first northern NGOs following the end of the civil war, has focused on a few selected locations and, with the support of public grant providers, carries out large projects in terms of fund volume. Under these conditions, it has been possible to contribute towards creating the suitable framework conditions for the engagement of other involved parties; this also expressly applies to national actors⁵⁾.

"Since the road has been made accessible again, following governmental organisations have again taken up their activities:

- *Basic health services: transport of patients from Barclayville to Zwedru hospital, inspection trips by County Health Officer in communities along road*
- *Education: inspection trips by County Education Officer in communities along road*
- *Security: Control trips by the Liberian National Police, Controls by Immigration Office, start of construction of immigration office building in Sasstown*
- *Labour Office: controls by Labour Inspectors."*

In addition to the integration of national structures, coordinating activities between international actors, also and in particular between the northern NGOs, has had a significant effect on the degree of outcome/impact of individual projects. This is highlighted with the example of a Welthungerhilfe project in Zimbabwe⁶⁾:

"In summary, it can be said that the project measures have an impact on the improvement of the health of the targeted group and have already reduced the threat of cholera due to the impact of the health and hygiene promotion as well as the supply of chemicals by (...). The capability of (...) to provide chemicals by themselves and the unstable power supply remain crucial issues in terms of the outcomes and impact of the project."

Sustainability

In contrast to previous years, there is no comprehensive evaluation regarding the sustainability of Welthungerhilfe projects. The reason lies in the already minimal number of samples, which are further limited by the fact that no information could be provided for 5 of 15 appraised projects.

In addition, an assessment of the sustainability of individual measures must also take into account that their sustainability is mainly determined by external factors over which Welthungerhilfe as an aid organisation cannot exert any control⁷⁾.

⁴⁾ Welthungerhilfe Strategy 2007 -2011, Bonn, April 2007, see page 32 and following

⁵⁾ Ronald Michiels, Main report on evaluation "Rehabilitation of roads and drinking water supply as well as conflict management in Grand Kru County in Liberia", page 12
Welthungerhilfe project number LBR 1021-07 and LBR 1025-08

⁶⁾ Ute Steinberger, Main report on evaluation "Chinhoyi Emergency Rehabilitation of Water Infrastructure Zimbabwe", page 2 and following, Welthungerhilfe project number ZWE 1040-09

⁷⁾ Ronald Michiels, Main report on evaluation "Rehabilitation of roads and drinking water supply as well as conflict management in Grand Kru County in Liberia", page 5
Welthungerhilfe project number LBR 1021-07 and LBR 1025-08

"Maintenance of the different waterway crossings will not be the bottle-neck, but maintenance of the roads themselves will be a continuous need. So far no maintenance mechanism has been set up. And up to this moment the responsible authorities have not shown much interest to take the necessary actions."

It is also important to take into account that the expectations of grant providers regarding the sustainability of the project are also influenced by the project duration, and the strategy related to the LRRD approach⁸⁾.

"ECHO emphasises that the measures should be sustainable particularly with regard to the transition period of 2-5 years until financing through development co-operation."

4.1.2 Other evaluations

Direct contribution towards achieving the millennium goals

The majority of the projects directly contributed to achieving the millennium goals. As expected, this applies in particular to the 1st and 4th millennium goal (elimination of extreme poverty and hunger as well as a reduction in child mortality).

Millennium goals 3 and 7 (gender equality and strengthening the role of women, along with environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources) are also pursued directly by almost 50% of the projects.

The result conforms to expectations, since the main focus of Welthungerhilfe's project support is on projects in the area of "Basic infrastructure" and "Rural and regional development", in addition to emergency response. At the same time, it is not possible to confirm more general conclusions with regard to goal attainment.

Quality of internal M&E

Almost all of the accepted project evaluations conducted, criticised the outcome-impact monitoring for the projects. In this context, it is important to consider that Welthungerhilfe has been making great efforts to introduce outcome and impact-oriented project planning and consistent outcome-impact monitoring for ordinary project routines since 2010. The evaluated projects were all planned before 2010, so that these efforts have not been able to take effect yet.

The idea of a learning organisation will require that efforts in this regard will start to show an effect in the future, and that this can be confirmed by future evaluations.

Frequently, the causes behind this criticism already manifest themselves as early as the planning stage, at least in situations in which indicators and/or the planned monitoring process focus on activities. On the other hand - and a point that has also been raised in many evaluation reports - project managers for projects implemented by Welthungerhilfe are often faced with (too) many tasks at the same time:

1) "There was only a very short field analysis before the elaboration of the project proposal for the EU. The limited framework of the EU call was a second, orienting factor for this project. Each offer to the EU tries to serve as much as possible the call in order to succeed. The project tried to compensate for this by a PRA [= Participatory Rural Appraisal]. Since the official launch of the project in February 2008, the project has conducted a PRA in 44 villages to collect base line data and to involve communities in the final selection of project activities."⁹⁾

⁸⁾ Ute Steinberger, Main report on evaluation "Chinhoyi Emergency Rehabilitation of Water Infrastructure Zimbabwe", page 2, Welthungerhilfe project number ZWE 1040-09

⁹⁾ Ingo Binnewerg, Main report on the evaluation "Improving Living Conditions and Strengthening Social Stability

2) *"It is particularly difficult that all projects are only of short duration. (...) This means that programme management is increasingly occupied with developing projects and financing proposals instead of being concerned with project implementation. Nowadays proposal application is time-consuming and costly, because of its high requirements and standards."*¹⁰⁾

3) *"A different aspect is what the project does with the information gathered. Well, most of the monitoring information is used in the daily work of the project staff and enables the social workers to keep [themselves] updated and plan their work. But the data are not used for systematic evaluations of the project's progress or achievements."*¹¹⁾

4) *"The Project Coordinator is overloaded with administrative and financial tasks, leaving insufficient time to concentrate on implementation activities, especially concerning technical matters (design, construction supervision)."*¹²⁾

5) *"All results were substantiated by indicators concentrating on activities and outputs rather than outcome and impacts. For example, the strengthening of CBOs [= Community Based Organisations] may not always automatically initiate sustainable and ensured livelihoods of their members. Technical knowledge transfer may not automatically lead to sufficient household income.*

*As a consequence, it was not possible during evaluation to establish a clear link between the outputs and the envisaged impacts as declared in the project purpose. Instead, the evaluators made observations to various degrees and at different levels across the villages as explained in the following chapters."*¹³⁾

Higher-level learning

The challenge for institutional learning consists not only of the technical aspect of a so-called "good / best practice" example, but also of testing and demonstrating under which social, institutional, ecological and economic framework conditions "good / best practices" can be transferred. This issue will be receiving more attention in the evaluation work in the future. Another objective is to prevent the "repetition of errors".

The 2010 evaluation reports can be used to derive some new as well as some familiar "comprehensive" insights and learning potentials.

*"At the same time, considering the extensive funding requirements, it can hardly be assumed that local small farmers will be able to independently continue and expand infrastructure improvements following the end of the project support."*¹⁴⁾

and Decentralisation in Rural Communities of Former Civil War Areas in Southern Sierra Leone", page 32
Welthungerhilfe project number SLE 1007-07

10) Hendrik Hempel, Main report on evaluation "Food Security and Flood Prevention in Kassala State",
page 30, Welthungerhilfe project number SDN 1053-08

11) Lutz R. Meyer, Main report on evaluation „Community Based Child Support Project Kirkos Addis Ababa,
Ethiopia", page 32, Welthungerhilfe project number ETH 1067-06

12) Ronald Michiels, Main report on evaluation "Improved Rural Water Supply for evaluation "Improved Rural
Water Supply for ASAL Mwingi District", page 7
Welthungerhilfe project number KEN 1059-07

13) T. Alexander Varghese & Beate Scherrer, Main report on evaluation "Poverty Reduction and Reinforcement
of Participatory Development Process in Rural Communities Resettled in Former Conflict Areas of Northern
Sri Lanka", page 17, Welthungerhilfe project number LKA 1061-06

14) Wille Ege, Summary regarding the evaluation "Local resource management in desertification zones in
arid south of Bolivia", page 2, Welthungerhilfe project number BOL 1027-06

"The project uses nearly only local materials. This takes time to implement the different activities, especially in an area with no mechanisation and labour shortage during the peak season. But on the other hand, this increases ownership and replicability."¹⁵⁾

"Energy saving coal stoves permit to save about 50% of coal consumption with a minimal input of materials (mainly cement). This simple locally available technology, introduced successfully in 7,000 households, has a great potential of multiplication."¹⁶⁾

"Because of previous experiences by the project, the community selects their own RT-members [= Rescue Team] within their society. The community knows the people best and ensures the capability and the degree of reliance of the each applicant and makes the RT to a more sustainable and reliable intervention group."¹⁷⁾

One evaluation report clearly refers to the coming challenges (in this case as a result of climate change). The examples below also highlight the important role of adapted technology in this context. But the same principle applies here as well, namely that Welthungerhilfe will be required to consider the necessary individual and societal need for change in line with project planning to a greater extent than has been done to date. The generally long time period that is required to effect changes in behaviour is frequently opposed - at least currently - by very short project periods.

"Furthermore the sustainability of agricultural production will depend on climate, soil and management conditions. There is only a small period suitable for ploughing and seeding. In principle, subsistence farmers are waiting for the first rain, before they start ploughing and seeding. Hence the time frame is not longer than 1 – 2 months. It is obvious that with hoes and manpower alone, farmers cannot cultivate more than an average of one feddan, about 4,200 m². (...) Even animal traction will not allow people to cultivate sufficiently large areas as shown by other projects' example.

There should be no doubt that farming under these difficult and unpredictable conditions means a high risk for the rural population. It takes time until subsistence farmers and nomads become familiar with appropriate techniques and are able to increase production. Without strong external support (from the project), an intensified use of tractors for ploughing and seeding and the extension of cultivated land, food security is not achievable."¹⁸⁾

The success of the project depends just as much on the "what" (project contents) as it does on the "how" (type of implementation). This relates not just to the question of whether a project is implemented by a southern partner or Welthungerhilfe itself. The role that can be or should be played by the over 2,500 national, local staff within Welthungerhilfe also plays a key role in this context.

"That means that Welthungerhilfe should move from employing mainly foreign experts towards local experts as Head of Project. They are available countrywide. Local experts as project coordinator should be comprehensively trained. They can be supported by expatriate administration staff. Qualified and experienced ex-employees should be contracted to

15) Ingo Binnewerg, Main report on evaluation "Improving Living Conditions and Strengthening Social Stability and Decentralisation in Rural Communities of Former Civil War Areas in Southern Sierra Leone", page 45, Welthungerhilfe project number SLE 1007-07

16) Prof. Dr. Gerald Kapp, Main report on evaluation "Improvement of Food Security and Peoples Livelihood on Sloping Lands in DPR Korea, page 49, Welthungerhilfe project number PRK 1042-08

17) Dirk G. Zerhusen, Main report on evaluation "Capacity building for disaster preparedness in Rasht Valley, Tajikistan", page 35, Welthungerhilfe project number TJK 1063-08

18) Hendrik Hempel, Main report on evaluation "Food Security and Flood Prevention in Kassala State", page 21, Welthungerhilfe project number SDN 1053-08

work as senior advisers doing project support e.g. on a consultancy base. For instance the project coordinator of (...) is highly recommended as a senior advisor and trainer for local experts. He should be considered as an effective resource person." ¹⁹⁾

4.1.3 Annual theme "Help towards Self-Help"

Welthungerhilfe has also been studying higher-level issues in the individual project evaluations ("annual theme of the evaluation") on a systematic basis since 2006. The annual theme for 2008 and 2009 was "help towards self-help". During this time period, a total of 41 projects were reviewed for to the extent to which they provide "help towards self-help". The criteria for the evaluation were based on the Welthungerhilfe working paper "Help towards self-help in programme work" of 2007.

A synthesis report was prepared in 2010; its key results are briefly outlined below:

- In total, the implemented projects achieved support of self-help at a medium (41%) to good (37%) level of quality. Support of self-help is assessed as weak for 17% of the projects.
- The strength of the projects in the area of self-help support is in the establishment of user communities and support for these groups by way of educational measures. In contrast, the qualification of groups to assert their interests ("empowerment") does not play a major role in this regards.
- Central instruments for self-help support to eliminate structural poverty, such as support for networks, superordinate structures and local partner organisations are not used enough.
- Successful practices for help towards self-help can be seen mainly in longer-term programmes for rural development, and long-term cooperation with partner organisations.
- One weakness of the examined projects is the lack of a clear strategic direction on help towards self-help.

The resulting recommendations for action were prepared by the unit in the form of a "Management Response". Staff in charge also had an opportunity provide comments on the recommendations before the response was forwarded to the Executive Board for a decision. This made it possible to include the operational knowledge of staff into the decision-making process of the Executive Board, and allow for the involvement of those responsible for implementation prior to a decision being made.

A clear strategic direction will also have to be found in the "Position paper on the promotion of civil society".

4.1.4 Sector and programme evaluations

The Welthungerhilfe regional programme for Ethiopia / Somaliland and the sector programme WASH were evaluated in 2010.

It is not possible to provide statements on the results of the sector evaluation at this time. Overall, it concerns an extensive project that consists of four individual elements and is carried out in close coordination with the Knowledge Innovation Consultancy Unit of the Programme and Projects department; detailed information about these elements will be included in the next annual report.

The evaluation of the Ethiopia regional programme is an interim evaluation, on the basis of which an analysis and valuation of the ongoing programme phase 2010-2012 will be carried

19) Hendrik Hempel, Main report on evaluation "Food Security and Flood Prevention in Kassala State", page 48
Welthungerhilfe project number SDN 1053-08

out. The Ethiopia regional programme focuses on the two sectors of support "Drinking water and sanitary services" (basic infrastructure) and "Resource management / Biodiversity" (rural and regional development). Smaller measures in the educational area and youth social work are also being supported. Cooperation with local partner organisations plays an important role. Central recommendations include:

- Early integration of an M&E system.
- Improve the structural quality of infrastructure facilities to warrant their efficient construction and sustainable use.
- Water fees to cover costs must be considered with regard to the projects combined in the support sector Drinking water supplies / Sanitary systems / Hygiene (WASH). In addition, educational programmes for operator groups of drinking water systems should place greater emphasis on the "hygiene" aspect.
- Within the resource management / biodiversity sector of support, the most important recommendations are directed at achieving greater effects or support for sustainability. This also means that it is not just the most degraded areas that are included in protection or rehabilitation measures, but rather all zones that are at risk, even if they can still be cultivated from the viewpoint of the users.
- Continuous support for most partner organisations is important particularly in the area of organisation management, administration and outcome/impact monitoring.

Despite some difficulties, the close working relationship with local partners is viewed as "exemplary cooperation between Welthungerhilfe, partners and government agencies". At the same time, there is also a recommendation to provide better clarity as to the future role of partner cooperation in the country for Welthungerhilfe, and the function that is to be assumed by the respective partner organisation. Should partners with local knowledge and in-depth knowledge of local conditions be considered as service providers, or should the organisations in the country be enabled to solve their problems on their own and contribute towards societal development in the country? Welthungerhilfe must determine specific support requirements in accordance with the desired direction.

4.2 Evaluation of project work in Germany

The units have also been evaluating project work in Germany since 2007. This represents a contribution to the implementation of Strategy 2007-2011, which formulates the following indicator for evaluating project work in Germany:

"50% of project work in Germany has been evaluated, and the results of the evaluations will be implemented until 2011."²⁰⁾

The evaluation of the German project "Support for member organisations 2010-2012" was planned for 2010. It was postponed to 2011 due to the vacancy of the relevant position, which lasted more than six months. In addition, the evaluation of the project "Lobby work world food / rural development / magazine rural 21" is also planned for 2011, so that the quantitative part of the indicator will be addressed for the German projects despite the one-year "evaluation break". The next annual report will discuss whether the results and recommendations of all evaluations implemented in the 2007-2011 strategy period have been implemented.

²⁰⁾ See performance area 2, sub-goal: Welthungerhilfe sets above-average quality standards in its German programme and project work.

5 Looking towards 2011

Against the background of realised project support in 2010 (over EUR 160 million) and intended project support in 2011 (EUR 134 million), along with the total number of projects currently being implemented in Germany and abroad (279 projects as per 28 February 2011), the unit has only limited capability to meet its mandate for comprehensive learning and accountability in 2011 due to current appraisal planning.

To ensure that the evaluation work and resulting reflection work is more effective and efficient, the following modifications will be applied as of 2011 (among others):

- ✓ Intensification of involvement and feedback as well as "revaluation" of "on-site debriefing", since the ability to address evaluation results at the local level gains in importance with an increasing degree of decentralisation (generally, most of the addressees of the evaluation are located on site).
 - Inclusion of local staff, integration of target group representatives at on-site final meeting (implementation of HAP principle).
 - Participation by unit S01 in on-site final meetings for evaluations of country programmes and sector evaluations.
 - Changing the (hitherto) generally full-day final meeting at the head office into a maximum two hour intensive block for presentation/technical discussion, that allows for the participation of the Directors and the Knowledge Innovation Consultancy Unit, followed by formal final reflection and clarification of possibly still pending queries by S01.
- ✓ Follow-up re: handling of recommendations on the basis of a standardised "management response".
- ✓ Terms of reference and appraisals:
 - Explicit valuation of degree of goal attainment in respect of project planning by the reviewers for the 5 DAC criteria;
 - New inclusion of item "use of output" taking into account the documentation of concrete "case studies";
 - Separation of item "outcome and impact" into two separate items and concrete description of changes for target group;
 - Appraisal to be limited to a maximum of 35 pages (not including Annex but including summary);
 - Preparation of a "1 page" summary with a focus on special aspects for planning, implementation or monitoring;
In addition, direct personal contact between employees should be made possible (direct communication as central element of a learning organisation).
- ✓ Inclusion of the results of decentralised evaluations (i.e. local external evaluations organised by the regional office on location, which correspond with the minimum requirements of the TOR standard) in the evaluation unit's annual report.
- ✓ Preparation of an English-language version of the unit's annual report and "linking" of individual appraisals with the annual report.
- ✓ Introduction of two-year evaluation planning, to be updated on a periodic basis, which includes planned evaluations by the unit as well as local decentralised evaluations ("reviews").

6 Management letter and recommendations

Similar to its Alliance2015 partners, Welthungerhilfe is committed, although with a critical stance, to the "Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness" and subsequent meetings in Accra, and therefore emphasises, within the limits of its abilities, the call for self-responsibility on the

part of partner countries and partners, coherence of development strategies, results orientation in resource management and mutual accountability and transparency.

Although the limited number of appraisals performed in 2010 makes it very difficult to speak of "representativeness", the following management recommendations have been suggested based on the appraisals and final meetings, as well as comparisons with previous years and the declared "Welthungerhilfe Strategy 2007 - 2011":

1. Recommendation

The transfer of so-called "good/best practice" examples to other projects requires an in-depth environmental analysis conducted in advance, with a central focus on the specific social, institutional, ecological and economic framework conditions.

Technically functional solutions are a required but not sufficient condition for successful projects, because the project purpose does not consist of the establishment of output but rather the use of output and the resulting short-term and medium-term outcomes/impacts. And use of output as a prerequisite for an outcome/impact depends greatly on the aforementioned framework conditions. The questioning and in particular documentation of these framework conditions forms a basic prerequisite for any "scaling-up considerations", applications or distribution considerations.

2. Recommendation

Welthungerhilfe should also clarify the future role of national staff in view of the aspect "National staff as management", and adapt its "National Staff Policy" if required.

It can be assumed that national staff, especially those who are well qualified, will pursue the same career objectives as Welthungerhilfe staff sent on assignment, or staff at the head office. To ensure the long-term loyalty of qualified national staff and hence the continuity of Welthungerhilfe's work, there should be clarity regarding their career perspectives within Welthungerhilfe (including hierarchical perspectives).

3. Recommendation

Welthungerhilfe should develop a clear understanding regarding the subject and objective of its cooperation with southern NGOs and partners.

This recommendation does not target a specific form of cooperation. Welthungerhilfe works in very different contexts, countries and locations, and pursues its own strategic objectives in a completely legitimate manner. Because this results in very different forms of cooperation, the form and objective must be clear for each individual case. This/these form(s) must be clearly outlined in the respective country programme, partner concept and position paper on the "Promotion of civil society in the partner countries". Cooperation with southern NGOs is not automatically associated with the local promotion of civil society.

Annex 1: A life story from Sierra Leone

MRS THERESA BOIMA'S ACCOUNT

Mrs Theresa Boima was born in February 1954 in Ngalu Bagbwe Chiefdom, Bo District to Pa Scott Manga and Nasu Managa. She went to school and dropped out of school in form one in 1970. After her initiation into the Bondo Society, she went to stay with her uncle in a mining town of Tongo. Having spent three years in Tongo, she came back to live with her father in Bo. During this period, she was engaged in selling firewood and palm wine for her father.

Two years later, Theresa got married to Mr. Thomas Boima who was then a student in a Teacher Training College in Bo. After finishing his course (T.C.) Mr. Boima and Theresa went to stay in Njala Komboya Chiefdom where they gave birth to two sons, Peter and Daniel. After some years in this relationship, Theresa's husband divorced her and sent her and the children to her parents at Ngalu. She stayed with her parents for eight years during which period the war broke out in the country.

During the war, Theresa and her children suffered greatly while staying with her father, a polygamous family of ten (10) wives, countless children and grand children. At this time, they were staying in the bush at Ngalu living on cassava and fruit. Life in the bush became very difficult since their hide-outs were often discovered by the rebels. Their family therefore decided to find refuge in Bo Town.

In Bo, she got married to a police officer by the name of Mohamed Mansaray who took her to his operational areas of Mano Dasie and Taiama. In Taiama, life was not easy. They lived in the bush for five years, moving from one hide-out to another. They were often harassed by rebels who always carried away their entire foodstuffs. She gave birth to a son by this husband, the son is presently an apprentice in Ngalu. Sadly though, her husband Mohamed Mansaray was killed by rebels in one operation at Taiama.

After this sad event, Theresa came back to Bo and stayed in a camp for displaced persons with her one-year old son. In the camp she built a hut and started selling palm wine and fire wood in order to get food.

At the end of the war, her father and the two grown-up sons first returned to Ngalu and built a house for the family. The rest of the family members together with Theresa re-settled in Ngalu were some NGOs supported them with seed rice, farming tools, built stores etc. With the re-introduction of democracy and decentralization process after the war, the Ngalu community benefited from many projects like school construction, rehabilitation of health posts, court barriers, roads etc. People began doing their agricultural social and economic activities once more. Many houses had been re-built, life is better with the advent of peace than before.

Last year, the Ngalu community suffered strong winds which destroyed many houses. A.D.D.O (Arch Diocesan Development Office) and Caritas rescued the community by providing household and building materials for the affected families to re-build their houses. With the intervention of Welthungerhilfe and CARD S/L in some communities in the ward, there are improvements in water and sanitation, functional adult literacy programmes and income generating activities have empowered most women and their social and economic lives have started to improve. Thanks to God, Teresa affirmed that life is better now than in the war period.

(Interview by Andrew Karim)

Annex 2: Number and overall result of evaluations carried out in 2010

	Sector of support	Title	Number of appraisals 2010	Number of projects as per 31 December 2010 (Special)	Amount of allocation	Advance settlements at time of evaluation	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Outcome and Impact	Sustainability
Latin America & Caribbean											
Bolivia 1027-06	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Resource Management	Local resource management in desertification zones in the arid south of Bolivia	1		1.230.100	630.101					
Latin America & Caribbean, total			1	69	1.230.100	630.101					2,00
South, south-east and central Asia											
North Korea 1042-08	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Food security	Promotion of food security and improvement of living conditions for the local population on marginal hillside locations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	1		1.140.000	662.211					
Sri Lanka 1061-06	<u>Basic infrastructure:</u> Social infrastructure	Poverty Reduction and Reinforcement of Participatory Development Process in Rural Communities Resettled in Former Conflict Areas of Northern Sri Lanka	1		980.500	863.183					
Tajikistan 1063-08	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Disaster preparedness	Disaster preparedness - central Tajikistan	1		500.000	418.708					
South, south-east and central Asia, total			3	107	2.620.500	1.944.102					2,00
West and central Africa											
Burundi 1010-07	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Food security	Food security and peace in northern Burundi	1		2.389.421	2.217.156					
Liberia 1021-07 & 1025-08	<u>Basic infrastructure:</u> Road construction	Rehabilitation of roads and drinking water supply and peacekeeping in Grand Kru County	1		3.902.000	3.203.246					
Sierra Leone 1007-07	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Integrated rural development	Rural development in the south of Sierra Leone	1		1.015.000	727.134					
West and central Africa, total			3	49	7.306.421	6.147.536					1,67
East and southern Africa											
Burundi 1067-06	<u>Social integration and education:</u> Social integration	Charitable orphan support	1		300.000	292.747					
Kenya 1059-07	<u>Basic infrastructure:</u> Water supply and water waste management	Improving water supplies in the ASAL Mwingi District	1		2.125.846	1.804.222					
Sudan 1053-08	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Disaster preparedness	Food protection and water conservation in Kassala State, east Sudan	1		1.292.019	464.377					
Sudan 1056-08 & 1067-09	<u>Emergency response</u> Food / drinking water	Food security and improving living conditions for IDPs in refugee camps and inhabitants of rural regions and regions close to urban centres in northern Darfur	1		2.159.820	1.089.377					
Sudan 1057-08 & 1066-09	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Food security	Peacekeeping and improving living conditions for the population affected by war, and IDPs	1		2.410.032	1.646.334					
Zimbabwe 1027-07	<u>Rural and regional development:</u> Resource management	Water management project - Matabeleland	1		1.818.200	1.784.000					
Zimbabwe 1032-08	<u>Emergency response</u> Food / drinking water	Agricultural transition and drinking water project	1		1.653.670	1.539.553					
Zimbabwe 1040-09	<u>Basic infrastructure:</u> Water supply and water waste management	Rehabilitation of municipal water supplies - Chinhoyi	1		855.015	288.300					
East and southern Africa, total			8	60	12.614.602	8.908.910					1,60
Higher-level evaluations , international				2							
International evaluations, total			17	285	23.771.623	17.630.649					
							Total evaluation across all projects				
			Positive			Proportion - very good	80,0%	33,3%	42,9%	21,4%	----
						Proportion - good	13,3%	20,0%	35,7%	50,0%	----
					Proportion - satisfactory	6,7%	26,7%	14,3%	21,4%	----	
			Negative			Number of not satisfactory	----	20,0%	7,1%	7,1%	----
						Proportion - inadequate	----	----	-	-	----
					No information (x of 15)	----	----	1,0	1,0	----	

